arXiv:1408.4016v17 [nucl-th] 10 May 2015

J=0 T=1 Pairing Interaction Selection Rules

Matthew Harper and Larry Zamick
Department of Physics and Astronomy, Rutgers University, Piscataway, New Jersey 08854

May 12, 2015

Abstract

Wave functions arising form a pairing Hamiltonian E(0) i.e. one in which the interaction is only between J=0^+ T=1 pairs, lead to magnetic dipole and Gamow-Teller transition rates that are much larger than those from an interaction E(J_{max}) in which a proton and a neutron couple to J=2j. With realistic interactions the results are in between the 2 extremes. In the course of this study we found that certain M1 and GT matrix elements vanish with E(0). These are connected to seniority and reduced isospin selection rules. We find the surprising result that the M1 strength to the "single j scissors" is larger for a J=0 T=1 pairing interaction than it is for Q.Q.

1 Introduction

We have recently performed single j shell studies of both schematic and realistic interactions[1]. They ranged from the J=0^+ T=1 to the J_{max} T=0 interactions. In this work we will focus more on the experimental consequences of choosing a given interaction. In particular we study Gamow-Teller and isovector M1 matrix elements for transitions in Sc and Ti isotopes. Some of the problems have been addressed numerically in a previous publication [2], but here we will present analytical proofs.

1.1 The Interactions

For two particles in a single j shell the states of even angular momentum J have isospin T=1 and those of odd J have T=0. For convenience; we define E(J) as a two body interaction which is zero except when the two particles couple to J. Hence, we have the J=0^+ T=1 pairing interaction designated as E(0) and the other extreme E(J_{max}) which acts only in the T=0 state with J_{max} =2j. The T=0 odd J interaction acts only between a neutron and a proton. We only consider charge independent interactions in this work. For a "realistic" interaction in the $f_{7/2}$ shell we use the MBZE interaction [3]. This is based on the works of Bayman et al. and McCullen et al. [4,5] but with improved T=0 two-body matrix elements[4]. From J=0 to J_{max}=7 the matrix elements, which were obtained from experiment are:

$$(0.0000, 0.6111, 1.5863, 1.4904, 2.8153, 1.5101, 3.2420, 0.6163) \tag{1}$$

Although the J=0^+ matrix element is the most attractive; in MBZE one also has low lying T=0 levels with J=1^+ and J=$J_{max} = 7^+$. Indeed, one main thrust of the old papers was that there was a large probability in say, an even-even nucleus that the protons and neutrons do not couple to zero. Indeed; it was shown in ref [5] that a much better overlap with the realistic interaction was obtained with a quadrapole-quadrapole interaction(Q.Q) than with the J=0 pairing interaction. We should also mention here the work on GT by Lawson[6] who invoked a K selection rule to explain why GT matrix elements decrease with neutron excess.

2 Wave Functions And Quantum Numbers for a J=0 T=1 Pairing Interaction of a Q.Q. Interaction

In this section we present energy levels and wave functions of ^{43}Sc and ^{44}Ti which have a J=0 T=1 pairing interaction of Flowers and Edmonds [7,8] and a Q.Q. interaction. The wave functions are presented as column vectors of probability amplitudes. To identify the higher isospin states we subtracted 3 MeV from all T=0, two-body matrix elements for the pairing interaction. Doing so does not affect the wave functions of the non-degenerate states, but it will remove degeneracies of states with different isospins. For Scandium isotopes we indicate a star ($*$) for states with T=3/2. For ^{44}Ti we indicate a star for T=1 and two stars ($**$) for T=2.

Table 2.1 Energies(MeV) and Wave Functions of ^{43}Sc with a J=0 T=1 Pairing Interaction

I=5/2

J_p	J_n	1.125	1.125	5.625*
3.5	2.0	0.4210	-0.4600	0.7817
3.5	4.0	0.4695	0.8479	0.2462
3.5	6.0	0.7761	-0.2633	-0.5730

I=7/2

J_p	J_n	0.000	1.125	1.125	4.875*
3.5	0.0	0.8660	0.000	0.000	0.500
3.5	2.0	0.2152	-0.8924	-0.1358	0.3727
3.5	4.0	0.2887	0.1565	0.8014	0.500
3.5	6.0	0.3469	0.4232	-0.5826	0.6009

I=9/2

J_p	J_n	1.125	1.125	5.625*
3.5	2.0	-0.1015	0.9416	-0.3212
3.5	4.0	0.4930	0.3280	.08058
3.5	6.0	0.8641	-0.0766	-0.4975

Table 2.2 Energies(MeV) and Wave Functions of ^{44}Ti with a J=0 T=1 Pairing Interaction

I=0

J_p	J_n	0.000	0.750**	2.25	2.25
0.0	0.0	0.8660	-0.5000	0.000	0.000
2.0	2.0	0.2152	0.3737	0.8863	0.1712
4.0	4.0	0.2887	0.5000	-0.1244	-0.8070
6.0	6.0	0.3469	0.6009	-0.4461	0.5652

I=1

J_p	J_n	1.500*	2.250*	2.250*
2.0	2.0	0.1992	0.9258	0.3212
4.0	4.0	0.4879	-0.3780	0.7868
6.0	6.0	0.8498	0.0000	-0.5270

I=2

J_p	J_n	1.000	1.250	1.750	2.250	2.250	2.250	2.250	2.250	2.250
0.0	2.0	0.6455	0.7071	-0.2887	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
2.0	0.0	0.6455	-0.7071	-0.2887	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
2.0	2.0	-0.1205	0.0000	-0.2694	0.6032	0.3665	-0.0549	-0.0618	-0.3799	0.5134
2.0	4.0	0.1730	0.0000	0.3869	-0.1407	-0.4053	-0.0033	0.2281	-0.7442	0.1746
4.0	2.0	0.1730	0.0000	0.3869	0.6458	0.1122	0.1532	0.1480	-0.0348	-0.5867
4.0	4.0	-0.0193	0.0000	-0.0431	0.0193	0.0946	-0.5433	0.8105	0.1821	0.0569
4.0	6.0	0.1403	0.0000	0.3138	0.3245	-0.4415	-0.5108	-0.3715	0.3276	0.2746
6.0	4.0	0.1403	0.0000	0.3138	0.0626	-0.0068	0.5991	0.2948	0.3981	0.5230
6.0	6.0	0.2292	0.0000	0.5125	-0.2997	0.6964	-0.2418	-0.2013	-0.0407	0.0973

I=2 (with shift in energy to remove degeneracies)

J_p	J_n	1.000	2.250	2.250	2.250	4.250*	5.250*	5.250*	10.750**	11.250**
0.0	2.0	0.6455	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.7071	0.0000	0.0000	-0.2887	0.0000
2.0	0.0	0.6455	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-0.7071	0.0000	0.0000	-0.2887	0.0000
2.0	2.0	-0.1205	0.1561	0.6065	0.6391	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-0.2694	-0.3350
2.0	4.0	0.1730	-0.3895	-0.1445	0.3056	0.0000	-0.6977	0.1151	0.3869	-0.2333
4.0	2.0	0.1730	-0.3895	-0.1445	0.3056	0.0000	0.6977	-0.1151	0.0869	-0.2333
4.0	4.0	-0.0193	0.1797	-0.3647	0.6726	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	-0.0431	0.6623
4.0	6.0	0.1403	-0.0861	0.4752	-0.0728	0.0000	0.1151	0.6977	0.3138	0.3785
6.0	4.0	0.1403	-0.0861	0.4752	-0.0728	0.0000	0.1151	0.6977	0.3138	0.3785
6.0	6.0	0.2292	0.7906	-0.0757	0.0165	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.5125	-0.2318

Table 2.3 Energies(MeV) and Wave Functions of ^{43}Sc with a Q.Q. Interaction

I=5/2

J_p	J_n	2.8243	3.0148	5.1306*
3.5	2.0	0.5053	0.7817	-0.3655
3.5	4.0	0.2885	0.2462	0.9253
3.5	6.0	0.8133	-0.5730	-0.1011

I=7/2

J_p	J_n	0.000	3.3016*	3.7874	5.4618
3.5	0.0	0.7069	-0.5000	0.4402	0.2376
3.5	2.0	0.6864	0.3727	-0.4393	-0.4439
3.5	4.0	0.1694	0.5000	-0.1549	0.8350
3.5	6.0	0.0216	0.6009	0.7676	-0.2218

I=9/2

J_p	J_n	1.4765	4.1843	5.6367*
3.5	2.0	0.9032	-0.2847	-0.3212
3.5	4.0	0.4186	0.4188	0.8058
3.5	6.0	0.0949	0.8623	-0.4975

Table 2.4 Energies(MeV) and Wave Functions of ^{44}Ti with a Q.Q. Interaction

I=0

J_p	J_n	0.000	6.6031**	7.5748	10.9236
0.0	0.0	0.7069	-0.5000	0.4402	0.2376
2.0	2.0	0.6864	0.3727	-0.4393	-0.4439
4.0	4.0	0.1694	0.5000	-0.1549	0.8350
6.0	6.0	0.0216	0.6009	0.7676	-0.2218

I=1

J_p	J_n	4.3648 *	7.3405 *	10.5620*
2.0	2.0	0.9109	-0.2082	-0.3563
4.0	4.0	0.3967	0.2040	0.8950
6.0	6.0	0.1137	0.9566	-0.2684

I=2

J_p	J_n	0.9665	4.6015*	6.4691	7.7501	7.7502**	8.5695*	10.4893	10.6179**	10.7351*
0.0	2.0	0.5807	-0.5255	0.2263	0.08223	-0.2887	-0.4146	0.1466	0.0000	0.2280
2.0	0.0	0.5807	0.5255	0.2263	0.08223	-0.2887	0.4146	0.1466	0.0000	-0.2280
2.0	2.0	-0.4331	0.0000	0.7001	-0.2689	-0.2694	0.0000	0.2554	-0.3350	0.0000
2.0	4.0	0.2513	-0.4562	0.1629	-0.35010	0.3869	0.3535	-0.2881	-0.2333	0.4085
4.0	2.0	0.2513	0.4562	0.1629	-0.35010	0.3869	-0.3535	-0.2880	-0.2333	0.4805
4.0	4.0	-0.0916	0.0000	0.4892	0.1211	-0.0431	0.0000	-0.5451	0.6623	0.0000
4.0	6.0	0.0403	-0.1255	0.0802	-0.2115	0.3138	0.4507	0.4533	0.3785	0.5302
6.0	4.0	0.0403	0.1255	0.0802	-0.2115	0.3138	-0.4507	0.4533	0.3785	-0.5302
6.0	6.0	-0.0099	0.0000	0.3198	0.75087	0.5125	0.0000	0.1334	-0.2318	0.0000

3 Assigning Quantum Numbers For J=0 T=1 Pairing

e of the fact that we have the energies and wave functions of the J=0^+ and J=1^+ states forming an explicit matrix digitalization. It is convenient to add a constant so that the states which are not collective are at zero energy. When this is done, the energies of the J=0^+ ^{44}Ti states are:

$$-2.25, -1.5, 0, 0 \text{ MeV} \tag{2}$$

and the energies of the 1^+ states are:

$$-.75, 0, 0 \text{ MeV}$$

We then fit these with the Flower's and Edmond's formula [7,8], as given in Talmi's book[9]:

$$\mathrm{E} = C\left\{\left(\frac{n-v}{4}\right)(4j+8-n-v) - \mathrm{T}(\mathrm{T}+1) + \mathrm{t}(\mathrm{t}+1)\right\} \tag{3}$$

C is most easily determined by the isospin splitting of the T=2 state at -1.5 MeV relative to the -2.25 ground state (in the shifted energies). We set $-0.75 = 2 \cdot 3C$, so that $C = -0.125$ (In general, $C = \frac{-1}{2j+1}$). The quantum numbers are shown in Tables 3.1 and 3.2. Previously; Neergaard [10] used this method to obtain quantum numbers in his study of N=Z nuclei.

Table 3.1 Quantum Numbers for ^{43}Sc with a Pairing Interaction

Energy	J	T	t	v
0	5/2	1/2	1/2	3
0	5/2	1/2	1/2	3
0	5/2	3/2	3/2	3
-1.125	7/2	1/2	1/2	1
-0.75	7/2	3/2	1/2	1
0	7/2	1/2	1/2	3
0	7/2	1/2	1/2	3
0	9/2	1/2	1/2	3
0	9/2	1/2	1/2	3
0	9/2	3/2	3/2	3

Table 3.2 Quantum Numbers for ^{44}Ti with a Pairing Interaction

J=0

Energy	T	t	v
-2.25	0	0	0
-1.5	2	0	0
0	0	0	4
0	0	0	4

J=1

Energy	T	t	v
0	1	0	2
0	1	1	4
0	1	1	4

J=2

Energy	T	t	v
-1.25	0	1	2
0	0	0	4
0	0	0	4
0	0	0	4
-1.0	1	1	2
0	1	1	4
0	1	1	4
-0.5	2	1	2
0	2	2	4

4 Results

The Gamow-Teller operator is $C\sigma t_+$. The wave functions for the Scandium isotopes are of the form

$$\sum \mathrm{D}(J_n v)[j_p, J_n]^I \tag{4}$$

with j_p, the angular momentum of the single proton equal to 7/2. Here $\mathrm{D}(J_n v)$ is the probability amplitude that the neutrons couple to J_n. The matrix element from McCullen [5]et al. is

$$M_{ij} = \sum \mathrm{D}^i(j, J_n)\mathrm{D}^f(j, J_n)U(1jJ_fJ_n; jJ_i) \tag{5}$$

We put the results of the calculated matrix elements in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 **

7/2-7/2	E(0)	MBZE	E(7)	Q.Q
^{43}Sc	0.3849	-0.2088	-0.10160	0.1207
^{45}Sc	0.2666	0.0927	-0.0027	0.0255
7/2-5/2(43)	zero	0.2020	0.2902	0.2763
7/2-5/2(45)	zero	0.0459	-0.0022	0.000792
7/2-9/2(43)	zero	-0.0818	0.0168	0.008380
7/2-9/2(45)	zero	0.0008	-0.0028	-0.02399

The results for the $7/2^+$ to $7/2^-$ transitions are shown in the first two rows above. We see that J=0 T=1 pairing gives the largest matrix element, MBZE is in the middle and $\mathrm{E(J_{max})}$ the smallest. Thus, we have the systematic that deviations for J=0 T=1 pairing lead to reduced Gamow-Teller matrix elements. It is not surprising that the realistic case, MBZE, is in the middle because the two-body interaction used in that calculation has both an a low lying J=0 part but also a low lying J=7 part. Of perhaps greatest interest is the fact that the matrix elements of GT for the E(0) interaction vanish when J_f is different than J_i. We have here considered the cases $J_i = (7/2)_1$ and $J_f = 5/2$ or 9/2, both for ^{43}Sc and ^{45}Sc . There is considerable discussion of the pairing interaction in the 1993 book by Talmi[9]. He has a discussion of odd tensor operators in space and spin. It is there shown that these operators conserve seniority. In this work on GT we have a product of an odd tensor operator in spin and an odd tensor operator in isospin. The general selection rules for overall isospin are that T_f can be equal to T_i, $\mathrm{T}_i + 1$ or $\mathrm{T}_i - 1$; although in the cases considered here, the latter does not apply. We will soon see that in general the GT operator does not conserve seniority. For the J=0 T=1 pairing interaction the lowest state in ^{43}Sc with $J_i = j = 7/2$ has seniority v=1. All other states for this and all other angular momenta have v=3 except the T=3/2 J=j state which also has v=1. In the $\mathrm{f}_{7/2}$ shell the latter state is unique. We see from Table 4.1 that if our initial state is a v=1 state with J=j (7/2 in this case) and isospin T=1/2 there is a non-vanishing matrix

element to a v=1 T=3/2 state and J_f=j. However, with a J=0 T=1 pairing interaction the matrix element from the v=1 state to v=3 states with J = $j+1$ or J = $j-1$ vanish. It should be noted that, although one constructs a J = j, v=1 state in say ^{43}Sc by first adding two neutrons coupled to $J_n = 0$ to the single proton; that is not the end of the story. One must introduce isospin wave functions and antisymmetrize. The values of D(J_n) for the v=1 J = j T=1/2 state for $J_n = 0, 2, 4$ and 6 are respectively (0.8660,0.2152,2887,0.3469). Consider the matrix element

$$M' = N\left(\psi^{J_f}\sum \sigma t_+(1 - P_{12} - P_{13})\left[j(1)\left[j(2)j(3)\right]^0\right]^j p(1)n(2)n(3)\right) \tag{6}$$

where $t_z = -1/2$ for a proton and $+1/2$ for a neutron. We can replace $\sum \sigma t_+$ by $3\sigma(1)t_+(1)$. Since $t_+ n=0$ we see that the $(-P_{12} - P_{13})$ terms will not contribute. We are left with $3N(j[\sigma j]^j)(\psi^{J_f}[j(1)[j(2)j(3)]^0]^j)$ and we can write $\psi^{J_f} = \sum D^{J_f}(J_n v)[j_p, J_n]^{J_f}$. Hence the last factor is simply $D^{J_f}(0)$. However, for a seniority v=3 final state, $D^{J_f}(0)$ is equal to zero. As mentioned before the only T=3/2 state with seniority v=1 is the one with $J_f = j$. The J=5/2 and 9/2 states all have v=3 and hence the matrix element M' vanishes for those cases, but there is a problem. The state on the right is a mixture of J=7/2 v=1 T=1/2 and J=7/2 v=1 T=3/2. We next show that the T=3/2 part also vanishes and this will imply that the T=1/2 part will also vanish. Consider a transition from J=7/2$^-$ v=1 T=3/2 in ^{43}Sc to J=5/2$^-$ or 9/2$^-$ with v=3 in ^{43}Ca. There is a close relation between Gamow-Teller transitions and isovector magnetic dipole (M1) transitions. If one removes the orbital part of the M1, keeping only the spin there is an isospin relation between the two transitions. We can transform the GT problem to one of M1 transitions in ^{43}Ca. But it is well known that for a single j shell of particles of one kind, i.e. only neutrons, all M1 transitions vanish.

We had previously displayed a formula for single j shell M1 transitions from an I=0$^+$ ground state to an I=1$^+$ state of an even-even nucleus[9].****

This can be generalized to an expression given in the appendix (11).

Note that the term with J_p=0 does not contribute. From this and the previous discussion on GT we see that it will also vanish for a J=0 v=0 to J=1 v=4 [15]. ****

(Note that this expression implies that isoscalar transitions vanish in the single j shell limit i.e. $g_p - g_n = 0$). In ref [2] the energy shifts and B(GT)´s starting from the initial J=0 v=0 T=0 state in ^{44}Ti were given, although no proof of the selection rule was given.

5 Results in ^{44}Ti

We show the calculated B(M1) results here. Along the vertical we have the I=1 states, and along the horizontal are the I=0 states.

Table 5.1 B(M1) Values in ^{44}Ti for I=1 to I=0 Pairing Interaction

State(v,T,t)	000	400	400	020
210	2.69963	8.0995	1.92994	0.898554
411	0	7.6793	0.11174	0
411	0	1.91866	2.89221	0

Table 5.2 B(M1) Values in ^{44}Ti for I=1 to I=2 Pairing Interaction

State(v,T,t)	201	400	400	400	211	411	411	221	422
210	1.02858	17.5613	0.0475777	2.29634	0	0	0	5.14334	0
411	0.181872	1.45084	0.0330685	1.8904	0	0	0	0.909075	8.2364
411	0.525607	1.4562	2.07128	3.32567	0	0	0	2.62751	0.465319

Table 5.3 B(M1) Values in ^{44}Ti for I=1 to I=0 Q.Q Interaction

I	0_1	0_2	0_3	0_4
1_1	1.31736	1.80213	0.183327	0.0413715
1_2	0.00146367	6.14543	9.041392	0.057738
1_3	0.000661312	0.153487	0.953011	0.205204

Table 5.4 B(M1) Values in ^{44}Ti for I=1 to I=2 Q.Q Interaction

I	2_1	2_2	2_3	2_4	2_5	2_6	2_7	2_8	2_9
1_1	0.885292	0	5.0018	0.0301273	0.0533539	0	0.0781581	3.36014	0
1_2	0.0126882	0	3.30166	18.1444	8.08602	0	0.0339801	0.347936	0
1_3	0.0000924735	0	0.180103	0.27692	0.534714	0	5.13135	8.26883	0

We see that with the J=0 pairing interaction there is a nonzero transition from a J=0 v=0 state to a J=1 v=2 state i.e. the M1 (or GT) operator does not conserve seniority. We can, in analogy with what we did for Scandium, form a ^{44}Ti state $[[jj]^0[jj]^0]^0$ and antisymmetrize. This will be an admixture of J=0 v=0 T=0 and J=0 v=0 T=2. We now have to show that the T=2 part vanishes when we overlap with a J=1 v=4 T=1 state and this will lead to the desired result that the T=0 part vanishes. It is easier to use an isospin transformation and consider the transition between a unique J=0 v=0 T=2 state in ^{44}Ca to a v=4 T=1 state in ^{44}Sc. The T=2 state can be obtained by forming the four neutron state $[[jj]^0[jj]^0]^0$ and antisymmetrizing. However, as shown before, we do not have to antisymmetrize in the matrix element. And clearly; the v=4 T=1 J=1^+ state will, even after antisymmetrization not have any $[[jj]^1[jj]^0]^1$ component. Thus, the T=2 part vanishes and so will the T=0 part. We will discuss the selection rules more systematically in the next section.

6 More Results – A Systematic Look at B(M1) Selection Rules for ^{44}Ti and ^{46}Ti

In the following tables, we make a systematic study of selection rules for B(M1) transitions with a J=0 T=1 pairing interaction. The states are classified by the quantum numbers (v,T,t) -seniority, isospin, and reduced isospin. We have already presented the values of B(M1) in ^{44}Ti Tables 5.1 and 5.2 – ^{44}Ti I=1 to I=0 and I=1 to I=2 pairing. Table 6.1 refers to large transitions in ^{44}Ti I=1 to 0, while Table 6.2 to its vanishing B(M1)'s. Tables 6.3 and 6.4 are for I=1 to I=2. Along the horizontal we have the I=1 states and along the vertical the I=0 and I=2 states. Analogously, Tables 6.5 to 6.10 are presented for ^{46}Ti.

Table 6.1 Large Values ($\geq$.5) for ^{44}Ti I=1 to I=0

	I=1	I=0	Value	I=1	I=0	Value
	210	000	2.6693	411	400	7.6793
****remove?	210	020	8.0995	411	400	2.8922
	210	400	1.9299	411	400	1.9187
	210	400	0.8986			

Table 6.2 Selection Rules ^{44}Ti I=1 to I=0

Selection Rule	I=1	I=0
$\Delta v = 4$	411	000
$\Delta v = 4$	411	020

Table 6.3 Large Values (≥.5) for ^{44}Ti I=1 to I=2

I=1	I=2	Value	I=1	I=2	Value
210	201	1.02858	411	422	8.2364
210	400	17.5613	411	201	0.525607
210	400	2.29634	411	400	1.4562
210	221	5.14334	411	400	2.07128
411	400	1.45084	411	400	3.32567
411	400	1.8904	411	221	2.62751
411	221	0.909075			

Table 6.4 Selection Rules ^{44}Ti I=1 to I=2

Selection Rule	I=1	I=0
$\mathrm{T} = 1 \Rightarrow \mathrm{T} = 1$	210	211
$\mathrm{T} = 1 \Rightarrow \mathrm{T} = 1$	210	411
$\Delta\mathrm{v} = 2, \Delta\mathrm{t} \neq 0$	210	422
$\mathrm{T} = 1 \Rightarrow \mathrm{T} = 1$	411	211
$\mathrm{T} = 1 \Rightarrow \mathrm{T} = 1$	411	211

Table 6.5 ^{46}Ti I=1 to I=0

State(v,T,t)	411	411	611	611	220	421	421
010	0	0	0.	0.	1.0799	0	0
410	2.8794	0.0491	0.	0.	2.4344	0.5611	0.4150
410	0.7573	5.7648	0.	0.	0.3947	0.1157	2.0588
611	1.0423	0.0987	2.3989	0.6317	0.	3.1539	0.2640
611	0.0049	0.1721	0.0001	1.7267	0.	0.0858	0.4450
030	0	0	0.	0.	9.7201	0	0

Table 6.6 Large Values (≥.5) for ^{46}Ti I=1 to I=0

I=1	I=0	Value	I=1	I=0	Value
411	410	2.8794	220	010	1.0799
411	410	0.7573	220	410	2.4344
411	611	1.0423	220	030	9.7201
411	410	5.7648	421	410	0.5611
611	611	2.3989	421	611	3.1539
611	611	0.6317	421	410	2.0588
611	611	1.7267			

Table 6.7 Selection Rules ^{46}Ti I=1 to I=0

Selection Rule	I=1	I=0
$\Delta\mathrm{T} = 2, \quad \Delta\mathrm{v} = 4$	411	030
$\Delta\mathrm{T} = 2, \quad \Delta\mathrm{v} = 4$	611	030
$\Delta\mathrm{v} = 4$	411	010
$\Delta\mathrm{v} = 4$	421	010
$\Delta\mathrm{v} = 6$	611	010
$\Delta\mathrm{v} = 4$	220	611
$\Delta\mathrm{v} = 4$	421	030?
$\Delta\mathrm{v} = 2, \Delta\mathrm{t} \neq 0$	611	410

Table 6.8 ^{46}Ti I=1 to I=2

State(v,T,t)	411	411	611	611	220	421	421
211	0.9874	0.3326	0	0	1.3712	0.0272	0.0019
211	0.4367	0.1472	0	0	0.1715	0	0.3238
412	0.0916	1.5360	0.	0.	0	0.0607	0.4819
411	0.0847	0.0914	0.4365	0.0065	0.	0.0374	0.0261
411	0.0041	0.0186	1.5191	0.0152	0.	0.0846	0.0668
410	0.0646	1.6850	0.	0.	12.1303	0.0832	0.5004
410	3.5617	0.1189	0.	0.	2.9785	0.6431	0.5838
410	0.4668	2.4445	0.	0.	5.3986	0.0273	0.9432
611	2.1377	0.2523	2.3618	0.0555	0.	2.9801	0.4370
611	0.2654	0.0135	0.1597	0.8390	0.	0.0329	0.2333
611	0.0616	0.1344	7.1099	1.4178	0.	1.4482	0.5082
611	0.0375	0.0024	0.0873	0.0461	0.	0.0123	0.0127
611	0.1215	1.3291	0.0001	5.7321	0.	0.0315	4.0036
221	2.2323	0.7524	0	0	2.5716	0.0398	0.0883
422	0.2746	4.6069	0.	0.	0	0.1821	1.4454
421	0.1804	0.0338	0.6123	0.0630	0.	0.3563	0.0188
421	0.0862	0.2962	5.2534	0.0019	0.	1.2615	0.2597
231	0	0	0	0	2.0572	0.5125	4.5230

Table 6.9 Large Values ($\geq$.5) for ^{46}Ti I=1 to I=2

I=1	I=2	Value
411	211	0.9873
411	410	3.5617
411	611	2.1377
411	221	2.2323
411	412	1.5360
411	410	1.6850
411	410	2.4444
411	611	1.3291
411	221	0.7524

I=1	I=2	Value
411	422	4.6069
611	411	1.5190
611	611	2.3617
611	611	7.1099
611	421	0.6122
611	421	5.2534
611	611	1.4178
611	611	5.7321

I=1	I=2	Value
220	211	1.3712
220	410	12.1303
220	410	2.9784
220	410	5.3986
220	221	2.5716
220	231	2.0572
421	410	0.6431
421	611	2.9801
421	611	1.4482

I=1	I=2	Value
421	421	1.2615
421	231	0.5125
421	410	0.5838
421	410	0.9432
421	611	0.5082
421	611	4.0036
421	422	1.4454
421	231	4.5230

Table 6.10 Selection Rules ^{46}Ti I=1 to I=2

Selection Rule	I=1	I=0
$\Delta T = 2$	411	231
$\Delta T = 2$, $\Delta v = 4$	611	231
$\Delta v = 4$	611	211
$\Delta v = 4$	220	611
$\Delta v = 2, \Delta t \neq 0$	611	412
$\Delta v = 2, \Delta t \neq 0$	611	410
$\Delta v = 2, \Delta t \neq 0$	611	422
$\Delta v = 2, \Delta t \neq 0$	220	412
$\Delta v = 2, \Delta t \neq 0$	220	411
$\Delta v = 2, \Delta t \neq 0$	220	422
$\Delta v = 2, \Delta t \neq 0$	220	421

7 Discussion of the Tables

We observe that B(M1)'s vanish in the following cases:
a.) In ^{44}Ti B(M1)'s (N=Z) from T=1 to T=1 vanish.
b.) ΔT=2 or more
c.) Δv=4 or 6
d.) $\Delta v = 2$ and $\Delta t \neq 0$
The selection rule for case a.) is well known. It is discussed in several places including the book by Talmi [9]. It can be explained by the vanishing of the Clebsh-Gordan coefficient (1,1,0,0—1,0).
For case b.) where the change of isospin is 2 or more units is also an easy to explain. These B(M1)'s obviously are zero because the M1 operator is of rank 1 in isospin. Some examples are: $(411)^2 \rightarrow (030)$, $(611)^2 \rightarrow (030)$.
In case c.) the change of seniority is more that 2 units i.e 4 or 6. The B(M1)'s for these cases also obviously are zero because the one body M1 operator can only uncouple one J=0 pair. Some examples are: $(411)^2 \rightarrow (010)$, $(421)^2 \rightarrow (010)$, $(611)^2 \rightarrow (010)$, $(220)^2 \rightarrow (611)$, $(421)^2 \rightarrow (030)$.
In case d.) we get vanishing B(M1)'s when seniority and the reduced isospin simultaneously change. The M1 operator can attack a J=0 pair and increase the isospin but that will not affect the the particles not coupled to zero whose isospin is indeed the reduced isospin. Examples of this are in the Sc isotopes where J=7/2 T=1/2 transitions to J=5/2 or 9/2 states with T=3/2 are forbidden with a pairing interaction. Also in the Ti isotopes $(611)^2 \rightarrow (412), (410)^3, (422)$, and $(220) \rightarrow (412), (411)^2, (422), (421)^2$.
There is one ambiguity-the case I=1^+ to 2^+; there are two (421) states. One has a non-zero B(M1) to (211) and the other does not. However, when there is a 2-fold degeneracy one can take arbitrary linear combinations of the two states and so get a variety of B(M1)'s.
We mention briefly that Zamick [11] had previously considered M1 transitions from J=0^+ ground states in Ti isotopes to J=1^+ excited states in the context of scissor modes. These transitions are sometimes called spin scissors excitations and have a fair amount of orbital content-not just spin. They bear some analogy to the scissors modes in deformed nuclei such as ^{156}Gd [12].
In the appendix we give detailed expressions for B(M1)'s and B(GT). It should be noted that such a relation between them has been previously discussed by L. Zamick and D.C. Zheng [13], but not in such a complete way.
Matthew Harper thanks the Rutgers Aresty Research Center for Undergraduates for support during the 2014-2015 fall-spring session.We thank Kai Neergaard for helpful comments.

8 Appendix

Formulas For B(GT)

$$X_1 = \sum_{J_p J_n} D^f(J_p J_n) D^i(J_p J_n) U(1 J_p I_f J_n; J_p I_i) \sqrt{J_p(J_p+1)} \tag{7}$$

$$X_2 = \sum_{J_p J_n} D^f(J_p J_n) D^i(J_p J_n) U(1 J_n I_f J_p; J_n I) \sqrt{J_n(J_n+1)} \tag{8}$$

$$B(GT) = 0.5 \frac{2I_f+1}{2I_i+1} f(j)^2 \left[\frac{\langle 1 T_i 1 M_{T_i} | T_f M_{T_f} \rangle}{\langle 1 T_i 0 M_{T_i} | T_f M_{T_i} \rangle} \right]^2 (X_1 - (-1)^{I_f - I_i} X_2)^2 \tag{9}$$

$$\text{Where } f(j) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{j} & \text{if } j = l + 1/2 \text{ e.g } f_{7/2} \\ \frac{-1}{j+1} & \text{if } j = l - 1/2 \text{ e.g } f_{5/2} \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

$$ft = \frac{6177}{B(F) + 1.583 B(GT)} \tag{11}$$

Formulas For B(M1)

$$B(M1) = \frac{3}{4\pi}\frac{2I_f+1}{2I_i+1}\left[g_{j_p}X_1 + (-1)^{I_f-I_i}g_{j_n}X_2\right]^2 \tag{12}$$

$$\text{Here } g_j = g_l \pm \left\{\frac{g_s - g_l}{2l+1}\right\} \tag{13}$$

$$g_{s_p} = 5.586 \qquad g_{l_p} = 1 \tag{14}$$

$$g_{s_n} = -3.826 \qquad g_{sl_n} = 0 \tag{15}$$

For the case T_f is not equal to T_i we find:

$$X_1 = (-1)^{I_f-I_i+1}X_2 \tag{16}$$

$$B(M1) = \frac{3}{4\pi}\frac{2I_f+1}{2I_i+1}(g_{jp} - g_{jn})^2 X_1^2 \tag{17}$$

$$B(GT) = 2\frac{2I_f+1}{2I_i+1}f(j)^2\left[\frac{\langle 1T_i 1M_{T_i}|T_f M_{T_f}\rangle}{\langle 1T_i 0M_{T_i}|T_f M_{T_i}\rangle}\right]^2 (X_1)^2 \tag{18}$$

With this simplification we see that B(GT) is proportional to B(M1).
Using bare values we find B(GT)/B(M1)= 0.1411 for j= 7/2 in ^{44}Ti.
The magnetic moment is:

$$\frac{\mu}{I} = \frac{g_{j_p}+g_{j_n}}{2} + \frac{g_{j_p}-g_{j_n}}{2(I+1)}\left[\sum_{J_pJ_n}|D(J_pJ_n)|^2\left[J_p(J_p+1) - J_n(J_n+1)\right]\right] \tag{19}$$

References

[1] L.Zamick and A.Escuderos, Phys. Rcv. C87 , 04430 (2013) .

[2] E. Moya de Guerra, A.A.Raduta , L. Zamick, and P. Sarriguren , Nucl. Phys. A 727 (2003) 3

[3] A. Escuderos, L.Zamick and B.F. Bayman, lanl arXiv.nucl-th/ 0506050 2006)

[4] B.F. Bayman, J. D. McCullen and L Zamick , Phys. Rev. Lett. 11 , 21=5 (1963)

[5] J.D. McCullen, B.F. Bayman and L. Zamick, Phys. Rev. 134B, 515 (1964)

[6] B.H Flowers, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A212, 248 (1952)

[7] A.R. Edmonds and B. H. Flowers, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) A214, 515 (1952)

[8] R.D. Lawson, Phys. Rev. 134,1500 (1961)

[9] I. Talmi, Simple Models of Complex Nuclei, Harwood Academic Publishers, Switzerland (1993)

[10] K. Neergaard,Phys. Rev. C90,0143018 (2014)

[11] L. Zamick, Phys. Rev. C31 , 1955 (1985)

[12] D. Bohle, A. Richter, W. Steffen, A. E. L. Dieperink, N. Lo Iudice, F. Palumbo and O. Scholten, Phys. Lett. B 137, 27 (1984)

[13] L.Zamick and D.C. Zheng, Phys. Rev. C37, 1675 (1985)